

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

**Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 Recite Patentable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action mailed November 3, 2004, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 11-307791 (JP '791), in view of U.S. Patent 6,300,556 to Yamagishi et al. (Yamagishi) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,942,050 to Green et al. (Green). Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,353,042 to Hanoka et al. (Hanoka) in view of Yamagishi, JP '791, and Green. Applicant notes that claim 1 has been amended. To the extent that these rejections apply to the claims currently pending, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections, as follows.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

the thin film amorphous semiconductor layer which forms the p-n junction between the crystalline silicon substrate is positioned opposite the light incidence side light transmitting member by interposing the crystalline silicon substrate therebetween; and

the light incidence side light transmitting member is positioned at a principal light incidence side.

In the Advisory Action mailed May 17, 2005, the Examiner asserts "Nowhere does JP'791 require that there is more incident light from any one side." Advisory Action of May 17, 2005.

Applicant respectfully notes that the abstract of JP '791 discloses that the glass plate 3 is positioned on the surface side of the module to which more light enters. Thus, JP '791 admits that the light incidence side light transmitting member is placed on the principal light incidence side. As stated in the response of April 5, 2005, positioning a p-n junction as close as possible to the principal light incidence side is well known in the art. Indeed, in JP '791, the thin film amorphous semiconductor layer, i.e., the p-type amorphous-silicon (a-Si) layer (13), which forms the p-n junction between the crystalline silicon substrate, is disposed **near** the principal light incidence side, as would be expected by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that in a solar cell module with a light incidence side light transmitting member positioned at a principal light incidence side, one of ordinary skill in the art would naturally bring the p-type a-Si layer (13) nearer to the light incidence side light transmitting member.

In contrast to that which is well known in the art, claim 1 recites the thin film amorphous semiconductor layer (a-Si layer) is positioned opposite the light incidence side light transmitting member by interposing the crystalline silicon substrate therebetween. Therefore, since the claimed invention recites a feature that opposes that which is well known in the art, i.e., that a p-n junction should be positioned at a shallower position, namely nearer to a light incidence side in

order to enhance output characteristics, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Furthermore, as noted in the Response filed on April 5, 2005, none of Yamagishi, JP'791, Careen and Hanoka, alone or combined, discloses or suggests a thin film amorphous semiconductor layer which forms the p-n junction between the crystalline silicon substrate is positioned opposite the light incidence side light transmitting member by interposing the crystalline silicon substrate therebetween; and the light incidence side light transmitting member is positioned at a principal light incidence side, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the combination of Yamagishi, JP'791, Careen and Hanoka. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is patentably distinct over the cited combination and in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 4, 5, and 7 depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 5, and 7 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 are in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing client matter number 107336-00018.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox PLLC



Michele L. Connell

Registration No.: 52,763

Customer No. 004372  
1050 Connecticut Ave. NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6104  
Fax: (202) 857-3985

MLC:mmi